DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 344 SP 022 163

AUTHOR Kirk, Edward L.
TITLE Workshops for Teachers.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Group Dynamics; *Inservice Teacher Education; Problem Solving; *Program Development; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

In the introduction to this monograph on the workshop as an effective educational function for inservice teachers, the need for inservice education is discussed as well as the particular value of workshops in meeting that need. The historical background of workshops is outlined in the second chapter, including selected definitions of workshops and discussions on characteristics of various types of workshops. The difference between a course and a workshop is delineated. Chapter 3 presents guidelines on organizing and conducting a workshop. Salient topics include: (1) how a workshop can be started; (2) workshop staff; (3) materials for the workshop; (4) how the workshop is operated; (5) duration of the workshop; (6) what topics are covered in a workshop; and (7) summary of workshop organization. The final chapter covers general principles for evaluating a workshop. A table, which lists and describes 16 techniques most commonly used for inservice teacher education, is included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229344

WORKSHOPS FOR TEACHERS

Prepared By

Edward L. Kirk
Abilene Christian University
ACU Station, Box 8010
Abilene, Texas 79699

February, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward L. Kirk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP022 163

WORKSHOPS FOR TEACHERS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need for In-Service Education 1
The Workshop as a Technique for In-Service Education 1

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORKSHOP

Historical Background: The First Workshop 6
Definition of a Workshop 6
Types of Workshops 8
The Characteristics of a Workshop 9
The Difference Between a Course and a Workshop 12

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZING AND CONDUCTING A WORKSHOP

How Can a Workshop be Started? 14
The Workshop Staff 14
Materials for the Workshop 15
How Does the Workshop Operate? 16
Duration of a Workshop 16
What Topics are Covered in a Workshop? 17
Summary of Workshop Organization 17

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATING THE WORKSHOP

Evaluating the Workshop 19
General Principles for Evaluating the Workshop 21
What is to be Evaluated? 21
General Summary 22

LIST OF TABLES

Techniques Most Commonly Used for the In-Service Education of Teachers 3

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need for In-Service Education

The need for an in-service program for the education of teachers has long been recognized. Such in-service education offers one of the best ways of updating and improving instruction. In-service programs for the education of teachers are needed because of the new developments in psychology, method, and philosophy; because of constantly changing social conditions; because learning itself is a continuous process; and because many aspects of teaching require some special training not provided by pre-service education.

Many agencies have assumed responsibility for the in-service education of teachers. Chief among these agencies have been the curriculum development programs of cities, counties, states, and regions. The first formal and widely used technique for providing in-service education for teachers was the "institute." From the "institute" to the present time, many different techniques have developed, used extensively for a time, and then relegated to a minor role as newer techniques came into widespread acceptance. A list of the various methods or techniques employed in the in-service education of teachers is shown in Table 1. One of the more recent techniques is the faculty workshop with which this paper is concerned.[1]

The Workshop as a Technique for In-Service Education

The workshop for the in-service education of teachers is now an established part of the educational scene in the United States and the community as well as the school system is increasingly involved. The workshop movement has spread far around the world to other countries and a respectable amount of principle and fact concerning the organization and operation of workshops is emerging. These materials are to be found scattered in a number of brief pamphlets and in periodical literature. Books devoted entirely to the workshop are very scarce.[2]

Mode Lee Stone, in her doctoral dissertation, draws three conclusions on the basis of a questionnarie which seem to favor the workshop as a procedure or technique for the in-service education of teachers:

1. Where a technique affords opportunity for a large amount of teacher participation, favorable opinion tends to increase. (It is believed that a genuine workshop affords such an opportunity.)
2. Where there is opportunity for the development of leadership, favorable opinion is expressed.
3. Older techniques still in vogue in some places, such as extension courses and college courses gain in disfavor as techniques in the in-service education of teachers.[3]

In a workshop situation, teachers have a part in determining what should be done, how it should be done, and finally, how the findings might be used in making desirable changes in the school program. A typical plan of procedure used by school groups in their cooperative work might be as follows:

I. Whole Group
   - A. Define problems
   - B. Work on problems
     1. Sometimes as an entire group
     2. Sometimes in committees
     3. Sometimes as individuals
   - C. Seek solutions by:
     1. Reading
     2. Conferring with staff members
     3. Conferring with consultants
     4. Conferring with other participants
     5. Conferring with specialists
     6. Observing in Demonstration School
     7. Accumulating references for future use
     8. Attending lectures
   - D. Report findings to whole group for discussion
   - E. Compile composite report
   - F. Invite criticisms from staff members and individuals
   - G. Devise and rewrite solution
   - H. Invite leaders from local community and specialists in the field to meet with group and aid in solving problem

II. Small Group
   - A. Same procedure as for I above

III. Individual
   - A. Define problem or problems
   - B. Begin attack through research and conference
   - C. Compile data
   - D. Secure criticism from consultant or staff member or other workshop participants
   - E. Revise data if necessary[4]

It should be noted that the foregoing description of procedure is essentially that of the scientific method for problem solving. Advocates of such a procedure would contend that it is illustrative of a good learning experience. The assumption is that no faculty, group, or individual could investigate a problem through reading, discussion, writing reports, and consulting staff members without seeing some need for change and without having some experiences which would better prepare them as teachers.

Table 1

Techniques Most Commonly Used for the In-Service Education of Teachers

Technique	Description of Technique
1. State Curriculum Bulletins	A technique commonly used to implement the extensive phase of the program, to establish a framework within which local experimentation can go forward.
2. Local Faculty Study Groups	Professional meetings held by the local faculty group, largely devoted to a study of the state program and of the state department bulletins.
3. Extension Classes	Special extension classes dealing with phases basic to an attack on instructional and administrative problems involved in reorganizing the curriculum.
4. Part-Time Consultative Services	The use of one or more staff members of the colleges to serve as part-time leaders or directors of curriculum improvement in school systems requesting such aid.
5. Cooperating School Workshop	The practice of bringing to the colleges (where a staff has been arranged to meet the needs) total faculties, including the administrators of schools who wish to attack as a total group their instructional problems. Study before and after the workshop period is also assumed.
6. Workshop for Individuals or Small Committees	Similar to the cooperating school workshop except that only a few members from each faculty are present. These may represent different fields or may constitute a committee from a single field.

Table 1 (Continued)

Technique	Description of Technique
7. Courses in College	Refers simply to courses in "How to use the new course of study," etc.
8. Principals' Planning Courses	Courses which are operated more or less along workshop lines in which principals study together: (1) to secure through experience what democratic procedures involve, and (2) to secure insight into bases of curriculum development. The aim is "to plan how to get the faculty to plan"—not to make single-handed a program to be imposed.
9. Inter-School Visitation	This is a technique in which provision is made for teachers to study instructional procedures used effectively by other teachers in actual classroom situations.
10. Changed Type Fifth Year Program	This involves a new concept of the work for the M. A. degree or at least a substitute for this degree. It would mean a fifth year of work having a direct bearing upon the needs of teachers in service who hold the B. A. or B. S. degree and who are engaged in implementing the newer trends in education in their classroom procedures from day to day.
11. District Conferences for Administrators and Supervisors	Some state departments hold as many as fifteen or twenty regional meetings to which administrators and supervisors only are invited. An effort is made to awaken interest in local curriculum, improvement, to stimulate study of state curriculum materials, etc.

Table 1 (Continued)

Technique	Description of Technique
12. District Conferences for Teachers, Administrators, Supervisors, and Laymen	Same as district conferences for administrators and supervisors except that teacher groups or at least representative key teachers are contacted directly along with supervisors and administrators.
13. Steering Committees	Many states have organized regions, counties, and local units for the purpose of promoting curriculum development. Often the promotion of ideas has been "from the top down."
14. Cooperating Schools to Develop Practices	Many states have attempted to issue descriptive examples of good practice. Few states have planned definitely to secure in advance the cooperation of total faculties of outstanding schools interested in producing changed practices in keeping with a basic framework.
15. Projects Involving Cooperation Between State Department and Professional Groups	Refers to the extent to which implementation of a curriculum program can be made possible through a cooperative effort of professional organizations interested in educational evidence.
16. Travel Under Guidance	This technique is used to develop social sensitivity necessary to a clear understanding of the function of the school in a democratic social order.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORKSHOP

Historical Background: The First Workshop

Although the term and the process had been used in other fields for a long time, the first workshop for teachers was held in 1936, at the University of Ohio under the direction of Ralph W. Tyler who was then serving as Chairman of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago.

This first workshop in education was a part of the Eight-Year Study—a study in which thirty secondary schools were released from college entrance requirements and examinations for a period of eight years. Dr. Tyler was conducting the evaluation program of the Eight-Year Study when he suggested some problems the teachers were having while in a conference with Robert J. Havighurst, Chairman of the General Education Board, which was supporting this study. Dr. Tyler suggested that many of the teachers in the study did not have the time, in the regular course of their work, to do the jobs that needed to be done. Dr. Tyler requested that the General Education Board make it possible for these teachers to meet during the summer to work on their problems.

As a result, thirty-five teachers came together at Ohio State University in the summer of 1936. These teachers were carefully selected and fully subsidized by the General Education Board.

In the summer of 1937, one hundred and twenty-six teachers met on the campus of Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York. In 1938, over five hundred teachers attended four workshops provided by the General Education Board.

In 1939, the Committee on Workshops of the Progressive Education Association officially sponsored ten workshops associated with major universities.[1]

These summer groups were not subjected to lectures or reports but went to work on the actual problems confronting them. Group process methods were employed and social activities were mixed with the professional.[2]

As can be anticipated when a new idea comes into being, dozens of other "workshops" turned up in teachers' colleges all over the country. Some of them were true workshops in spirit and ideal; others merely bore the name and represented the same summer couses of study taught in the same way. Many were probably guilty of applying the "workshop" term to attract customers.

Definition of a Workshop

Most writers on this topic insist upon a rather precise definition of workshop and decry the loose manner in which the term is applied to almost every conceivable gathering of teachers.

Tyler's[3] early definition of a workshop is cited frequently and is consistently supported by succeeding writers:

> The workshop is an arrangement whereby a teacher or a school officer may work intensely on a problem which he brings from his own school and may obtain the assistance of staff members from various fields of study, particularly from the fields of the curriculum, student personnel, evaluation, and administration. Workshop participants interested in similar problems form into small groups, and they also work individually with the guidance of various faculty members who give help on the particular difficulties that they face.

This same idea was expressed twelve years later in an article by Boykin:[4]

> . . . the term "workshop" is the name given to a new and bold experiment in education, an experiment which places the responsibility for learning upon the students. It is a place to which teachers and administrators can bring their technical problems and work out a solution under expert guidance, while enjoying the advantages of superior library facilities and the counsel of fellow educators with like problems. It is a situation in which people with definite problems organize to solve those problems under the leadership of experts and under their own steam. It is a device that will permit the development of the individual in intellect and personality; a protest against the weakness of the course as an educational technique which emphasizes content rather than integrated experiences. It is a setting in which a teacher can consider a problem in its entirety, not in unrelated partitions. It is a "case method" that proved so effective in legal and medical training. It is a functional experience for teachers. It is a growth in professional competency at its best.

Carter Good's[5] Dictionary of Education defines a workshop as follows:

> . . . an arrangement under special facilities, including particularly a wealth of source material and specialized personnel for group and individual conferences, are provided by an educational institution for individualized or small group study of eductional problems that are of special interest to advanced students of education or to teachers in service; frequently provided in such areas as curriculum, administration, guidance, higher education, and secondary education.

Stone[6] defines the "total faculty workshop" in the following way:

> . . . the practice of bringing to colleges—where a staff has been arranged to meet the needs—total faculties, including the administrators of schools, who wish to attack as a total school group their instructional problems. Study prior to and following the workshop is assumed.

Downes[7] defines the workshop in the following manner:

> A true workshop as originally conceived, runs over a rather long period of time; engages all the working hours of the participants who work, eat, and play together and includes a variety of activities such as conferences, spontaneous conversations, research in relation to both printed materials and life itself, lectures, consultations with experts, and so on. It has in its best expression none of the atmosphere or attributes of the formal class or meeting.

O'Rourke and Burton[8] state that, "A workshop is just what the name implies, a shop in which work is accomplished." They further state that, in a workshop, emphasis is upon the production of end results useful to and desired by the participants, and upon cooperative group discussion and work on common problems. They conclude that a workshop serves "an assemblage of persons working with expert assistance concurrently and cooperatively on common needs."

Perhaps a clearer definition of a workshop can be established by summarizing what a workshop is not. These four points are from O'Rourke and Burton:[9]

1. It is not a series of lectures, nor a series of meetings, nor a symposium, nor a conference, nor an institute.
2. It is not a device for orientating new teachers, nor for giving in-service training to beginners, to undertrained recruits. It is of no use for inexperienced personnel.
3. It is not a device for teaching subject matter more easily. It is not a place for listening and absorbing, but for working and producing. Instruction in subject matter belongs properly in courses organzed for that purpose.
4. It is not a research situation, though a good deal of research technique may be involved. (Educational leaders need, incidentally, to make much sharper distinction between research techniques and study skills than is commonly made. Much that is labeled research, particularly, "library research," is nothing more than the exercise of well-known study skills.)

The workshop is not intended for beginning teachers. The workshop idea presupposes that participants have already had experience, contact with educational problems, and ability to work independently toward solution of these problems under expert guidance and leadership. Neither is the workshop a place to do missionary work with relatively backward members of a school staff.[10]

The workshop is not a place for persons whose primary concern is scholarly research without reference to social significance. Workshops are designed to aid in the application of knowledge rather than in the acquisition of knowledge.[11]

Types of Workshops

There are at least two general types of workshops. First, there is the in-service workshop, including several categories, such as the preschool workshop, conducted for a period of several days or a week, or even two weeks, before

the opening of school; the workshop conducted during the school year; and the workshop conducted after the close of school.

The second type of workshop is that conducted in the summer on the campus of an institution of higher education, which runs anywhere from a period of one week to six weeks. The longer period is definitely preferred because of the difficulty of arriving at the best solution to any problem in a severely limited period of time.

Although the workshop conducted during the year may be very productive, it does operate under the handicap of serious lack of time. It may be easier to get all the teachers in a school or all the teachers who wish to participate in a workshop to attend a summer school session.[12]

The Characteristics of a Workshop

Heaton[13] seems to have given the first definitive statement on the characteristics of a workshop, focusing attention upon the participants:

1. The participant is given an opportunity to make an intensive study of an interest which has arisen out of his experience as a teacher.
2. The participant shares in planning a program of individual and group activities designed to meet his needs and those of his fellow workers.
3. The participant is provided with easy access to the services of various staff members, representing a variety of kinds of assistance.
4. Formal and informal association with other participants of varied backgrounds contributes to the participant's thinking on his specific problem, broadens his general professional orientation, and provides opportunity for experiences in cooperative activity.
5. An effort is made to interest the participant in the whole child, the whole school, and the whole community.
6. The participant's total experience as he studies a specific interest or problem tends to prepare him for the solution of other professional problems in the future.
7. Since workshops have been concerned not only with the professional problems of the teacher, but with his life as an individual, efforts have been made to afford opportunities for balanced living.

O'Rourke and Burton[14] give the most comprehensive listing of the characteristics of a workshop which I have been able to locate. They arrived at these identifying characteristics by a systematic analysis of literature and of the records of their own workshops. Their list of characteristics, minus some explanatory statements appears below:

1. The overall purpose must be clearly defined. A group requesting a workshop, or an institution offering one, should state clearly the major area or field as the organizing center. Problems presented by participants will thus have a clear relationship.

2. The activity in the workshop must be based upon the problems, needs, and interests of the participants. Both individual problems and group projects will be considered.
3. The specific problems of the participants should be allowed to emerge and be defined without pressure or steering from instructors.
4. Individuals with common problems should form tentative and flexible groups for work.
5. Participants should do the bulk of the work on their own problems, with assistance from staff members on call. There should be no assignments, no required papers or reports. Some newcomers to a workshop are often bewildered by this seeming lack of direction. The workshop is, however, not a laissez-faire institution. Participants who "catch on" soon find themselves doing more work than any series of assignments could produce. Workshop leaders often have the problem protecting participants from their own tendency to overwork.
6. The planning and process of the workshop is cooperative and participatory throughout. The principles and practices of group process are the same a good teacher should use in his own teaching. Facility in developing modern teaching methods may thus be developed. Social interchange is stressed.
7. The personal and social growth of individual participants should be fostered as well as the solution of their professional problems. Social events provide for the necessary "get-acquainted" period, for recreation and relaxation, and for the development of social skills.
8. Evaluation is continuous and exercised on products and processes, not on persons. Participants evaluate the workshop itself, evaluate their own products and those of fellow workshoppers. The general procedures of organizing, planning, using resources, discussing in groups, of summarizing, of reaching conclusions all come under continuous evaluation and improvement. The very processes and instruments of evaluation are themselves evaluated from time to time.
9. The length of the session must be adequate. This refers both to over-all session and to the daily meetings.
   A summer workshop is ordinarily six to eight weeks, with three weeks seemingly the irreducible minimum. Two-week sessions have been reported in several places as successful, but a great number of the shorter sessions are obviously not successful as workshops, though they may be valuable conferences.
   It is extremely difficult to get problems defined, groups organized and coordinated effort under way rapidly enough to accomplish much in two weeks. Pressure, speed, or imposed organization will defeat not only a workshop but any type of educational effort.
   The workshop in the ordinary six-to-eight-week summer session should be open all day, with varied activities and breaks. "Open all day" means that staff members and participants are free to use the facilities whenever they wish. Free reading, browsing, examination of exhibits, committee and small conference meetings are all valuable. More will be said later about the

organization of the workshop day. The workshop operated by a school system during the school year should be open to all individual teachers, to self-formed groups, and to the committees or other groups which are carrying out an organized educational program. The workshop room serves as a depository for collections of resource materials of all kinds and as a center for work groups.

10. The collection of resource materials of all kinds likely to be of value to participants should be as extensive as finances permit.
    a. Textbooks in principles of teaching, in educational psychology, in the teaching of the various subjects, on the problems and principles of development for elementary and secondary school curriculums, and any others deemed necessary.
    b. Curriculum documents of the dozen or more types which are available throughout the country. This collection should be as extensive as possible.
    c. The largest possible exhibit of children's books in the elementary workshop or books for adolescents if it is a secondary workshop.
    d. Collection of source units, proposed teaching units, logs of completed units, numerous charts, working plans of class groups, results of all kinds produced by a group while organizing and carrying on a unit.
    e. Some daily lesson plans of the traditional type but improved as suggested in modern textbooks
    f. Typical traditional daily or short-term assignments, ranging all the way from fairly bad to excellent. A collection can be built up by instructors.
    g. An extensive collection of tests of all kinds: intelligence, achievement, diagnostic, improved essay examinations, problem situations, battery tests, inventory tests, forms for interviewing, and the like.
    h. A collection of new type report cards; descriptive marking systems; cumulative record cards; any and all types of blanks used in administering a large school; school registers for rural and small schools; daily plan book; and all types of instruments for securing background material about the learner and the learning situation.
    i. An observation school or observation privileges or at least an ungraded room or two or three grade rooms should, if at all possible, be provided and operated in conjunction with the workshop. The observation or demonstration school may be used for case studies of individual pupils as well as for the demonstration of newer teaching procedures.
    j. A collection of films, filmstrips, still pictures, models, collections, all types of audio-visual aids should be available.
    k. The art and music workshops, where they are available, should have parallel collections within their special fields.
    l. A shop with tools and materials for construction and craftwork is highly desirable.

11. The instructional staff should represent a wide diversity of personnel.
12. The full-time staff may be based on the ratio of one member for each 12-15 participants. Some of the specialists may be on part-time basis.
    Classroom teachers, general supervisors, or any officer may serve as leaders of small groups organized around common problems. Specialist consultants on the particular problems of the given workshop may be called in as needed. Ordinarily, specialists should be available in the areas of principles of teaching, psychology of learning, curriculum principles and practices on both elementary and secondary levels, the education of gifted or of retarded children.
13. The physical facilities should permit varied experiences. In addition to a large general work room with separate rooms for small group conferences, for art and music activities, there may be a small theater, or lecture room, projection facilities, a room and tools for simple construction activities, large display boards, filing cases, typewriters, or any other equipment required. Trips to examine other school facilities should be arranged.

Diedrich and Van Til[15] also discuss the characteristics of a workshop. Their main points are listed here without the lengthy discussion which they include under each numbered item:

1. The activity of a workshop is based upon the problems, needs, and interests of the participants.
2. Each participant is expected to do something about his problem or his group project.
3. A workshop must exemplify the principles of democracy.
4. In general, a workshop does not evaluate its members. The members evaluate the workshop.

The Difference Between a Course and a Workshop

Although they do not object to offering courses, Diedrich and Van Til[16] suggest that courses should not be offered under the false pretense that they constitute a workshop. These authors offer the following "clues" to help determine whether a course or a workshop is being offered:

1. The Workshop members do most of the talking.
2. The Workshop members ask the important questions. Staff members ask questions chiefly to get the background necessary to answer the members' questions.
3. Every staff member is asked a great many questions which he cannot answer off-hand. He has to sit down with the individual or group and think through the alternative possibilities with them before he can venture an opinion.
4. Every staff member must expect that, when any given problem is being considered, more brilliant and usable ideas will be contributed by other members of the group than by himself.

5. The person who submits the problem is the final judge of what is to be done about it. No staff member is to tell him what to do, and expect the orders to be carried out. The staff member may offer suggestions; he may not dictate.

It will be noted that these "clues" also constitute desirable guidelines for staff procedure during a workshop.

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZING AND CONDUCTING A WORKSHOP

How can a Workshop be Started?

There are several procedures which may be utilized to get a workshop started in a local school system.

1. Staff members can be encouraged to attend out-of-town workshops held under the sponsorship of a university or some national organization. They could also attend a workshop being conducted in another school system. It would be hoped that their reports of their experiences would stimulate interest on the part of other staff members and make them want to attend a workshop or start one in their own school.
2. Another method would be to get a small group of the staff together and to discuss the workshop idea. Not all members of this group should be administrators or "status leaders." Out of this meeting could grow the nucleus of a workshop.
3. The supervisor, in his reports to the staff, could include descriptions of the results of workshops in other school systems.
4. Staff members could make visits to schools that have workshops in progress.

Any movement toward a workshop plan should be made with the understanding that it is to be done on an experimental basis and that its continuance will be based upon an evaluation by the staff, the community, and the school board. Some schools have found it wise to include members of the community and school board members in the workshop as a way of insuring that an accurate evaluation of the workshop reaches these groups. When such persons attend the workshop, the program is likely to become more dynamic and the results of it more far-reaching.[1]

The Workshop Staff

When it has been decided that a workshop will be held, the staff should be chosen from the leaders in the local system with outside consultants to be provided as needed. Having local leaders on the staff will help give the workshop a practical approach and win the support of the participants. Outside consultants will increase the variety of ideas, provide additional experiences for the teachers, give contact with people working in different localities, and provide authoritative guidance in special areas.

Two types of outside resource people are helpful. Some can serve as continuing workshop participants; others can be brought to the workshop for a day or for some special presentation at a general session of the workshop. Sometimes, outside consultants may work with small groups to assist in the solution of problems.[2]

O'Rourke and Burton[3] offer the following guidelines for the selection of the workshop staff:

1. Persons whose competencies will complement each other in part, and at the same time provide a range of abilities, should be sought.
2. Persons who as a group will be reasonably unified in basic thinking but provision for stimulating diversity is desirable also.
3. Persons with sufficient school experience to understand the specific problems brought in from the field by participants are a necessity.
4. Persons invited to the staff must know the nature and process of a workshop and be willing to participate in typical group process.

Different "titles" may be given to the personnel of a workshop as follows:[4]

1. A director. (Sometimes also a co-director, depending upon set-up and sponsorship.)
2. Assistants in the ratio of approximately one for every 15-20 students. These assistants should be chosen as resource persons suitable for small interest groups or larger groupings determined by the general theme and problems presented.
3. Specialists usually are regular members of the staff who are prepared in certain professional fields.
4. Consultants are specialists who participate in the workshop for a short period of time because they cannot be engaged for a longer time or because their fields of specialization would not be in continuing demand.
5. Secretary. Provision for a secretary, preferably full time, is of great importance.
6. Librarian. A regular librarian, or a committee of participants to handle materials, check them in and out, and to generally account for these, is essential.

Materials for the Workshop

The materials available could be said to "make" the workshop. An ample supply of materials, readily available when needed, is one of the prime considerations when planning a workshop. The nature of the materials depends, in large measure, upon the theme and purpose of the workshop. Some attention was given to materials in attempting to define the workshop. An additional listing of desirable materials, obviously abbreviated, for a general curriculum workshop would include the following:

1. Professional books for teachers on child development, the teaching-learning process, and curriculum design, with duplicate copies where possible.
2. Curriculum guides in copious supply from many school systems and covering the typical subjects—broad fields—or resource units.
3. Textbooks for children in the curriculum areas and levels covered by the workshop.
4. Pamphlets, booklets, magazines in abundance on appropriate areas and problems. (A clipping file if available is very useful.)

5. Films, filmstrips, still pictures, slides, recordings. Motion pictures and slides of actual school activities in different communities are of special value as discussion starters.
6. Projectors, screens, recorders, etc., to go with preceding items.
7. Bulletin Boards and other facilities for display.
8. Typewriters and duplicating devices. These are extremely useful and are too often omitted.[5]

How Does the Workshop Operate?

Whether working in the large general session or in small groups, workshop participants are encouraged to participate freely and to share leadership. The staff leader fades into the background as soon as he can get the small groups to plan and to carry on the work of their own choosing. He endeavors to serve as a counselor and resource person rather than as a chairman of the group.

Most workshops start with the formation of a planning committee composed of workshop participants in an effort to foster and encourage the involvement of every individual. The workshop staff makes a schedule and revises the program to meet the needs of participants and establishes policy and procedures. The planning committee seeks the recommendations of each workshop member concerning needed changes. This procedure allows flexibility in the program and yet gives each workshop member the security of a definite schedule around which he can plan his individual work.

Work groups are encouraged to keep an open line of communication with each other and to share the products of their work. Sometimes a workshop newspaper reports the progress of the different work groups. Frequently, several smaller groups with similar interests will meet jointly and perhaps use the same resource people. General sessions afford an opportunity for the different groups to exchange ideas. Membership in work groups can often be on a rotating basis so as to give participants a broader range of experiences.

Before the workshop closes the planning committee should make some provision for the different work groups to continue or carry out the work they have planned at the workshop. It might be possible for the group to meet somewhere at some future time; a round-robin letter system could be planned; or the teachers could exchange resource materials during the year. Every effort possible should be made to implement the workshop experience; it should not be allowed to "go to seed" the moment the workshop is over.

Duration of a Workshop

O'Rourke and Burton[6] contend that "to label a one-day conference a workshop is a reduction beyond absurdity which approaches intellectual bankruptcy." They further express doubt that a workshop on any important problem can be organized in less than three or four days. They believe that three weeks is an absolute minimum with five or six weeks being a more proper duration. Other writers do not express such a definite view as to the duration of a workshop.

What Topics Are Covered in a Workshop

The workshop is a very flexible technique and could, theoretically, deal with any topic or subject which was of mutual interest and concern to the workshop participants.

A survey of the literature indicates that workshop groups have concerned themselves with the following:

1. Curriculum and instruction on either or both elementary and secondary levels.
2. Physical education and health
3. Guidance
4. Mental health
5. Administration
6. Language arts
7. Mathematics
8. Unit construction
9. Instructional materials
10. Community resources
11. Citizenship
12. Group processes
13. Economic education
14. International relations
15. Intercultural relations
16. Family living
17. Integration
18. Survey of local schools
19. Community problems of various sorts such as community health
20. Evaluation

Summary of Workshop Organization

In this chapter an effort has been made to give a thumbnail sketch of the organization and procedure for conducting a workshop.

Chester T. McNerney[7] seems to have provided a fitting summary with these suggested steps to be followed in workshop organization:

1. Get acquainted. The emphasis in the term "workshop" should be upon work, and it is impossible for workshop members to evolve common problems unless they know each other.
2. Evolving the problem. Every workshop should have a purpose. Sometimes this purpose is stated as a theme for the workshop. Each group leader should state this purpose or theme and each individual should have the opportunity to react to the statement.
3. Defining the problem. Each group should specifically define the problem, including its limitations, which it is going to attempt to the best of its ability with the resources that are available.

4. Analyzing the problem. For example, the problem might be: How to teach understanding of different peoples and how best to get along with others. With a problem such as this there are several questions the answers to which will lead to a problem analysis. Consider the following questions:
   A. What is the source of the problem? Is this a problem that is common in all neighborhoods, all school cities or districts? Does the problem originate with the same group all of the time? Do all age levels need a solution for this problem? Why has this problem evolved in our school district?
   B. What effects does the problem have on our school and community life? Do groups attack each other? Are pupils discriminated against in school because they belong to a particular group? Are groups discriminated against in the community? Do the members of one group attempt to defile the cultural symbols of other groups, e.g., churches, homes, schools?
   C. What is the actual status of the problem at the present time? Does the problem seem to be increasing? Are facts and figures available that will objectively show the status of the problem? Do any authorities live in the community who would be willing to serve us as resource people?
5. Proposing solutions. The group should evolve several solutions to its problem. Each group should evolve several solutions to its problem. Each group is composed of many individuals and each one should be entitled to select the solution that for him seems most effective.
6. Evaluating the solution. The only way to evaluate the solution is to put it into practice. Unfortunately many workshop programs fail because this step is never accomplished. The supervisor should do everything in his power to implement the usage of workshop solutions.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATING THE WORKSHOP

Evaluating the Workshop

What really interests the staff of a workshop is to find out how effective the workshop has been and in what respects it ought to be improved. For this reason worshops usually utilize imposing questionnaires, eliciting comments in detail on every feature of the workshop.

Many times staff members have visited considerable numbers of participants in their schools to find out what effects of the workshop experience were observable in their teaching. A visit to about hundred workshop participants in the winter of 1940, seemed to warrant two conclusions:[1]

1. Workshops really change people in the most startling and spectacular fashion. People come home from summer school to teach their old courses in the same way that they were taught before; they come home from a workshop and begin making over the curriculum of the whole school from top to bottom.
2. Workshop members put into practice the things they did in the workshop—not the things they studied from books nor the things they merely talked about.

One of the best ways to evaluate any endeavor is to note carefully the results of it—to judge it "by its fruits." Several extensive studies of the results of workshops are available.

Stone,[2] in her study dealing with the total faculty workshop technique, pointed out the following results of the workshop:

1. Faculty meetings undergo significant changes. They change from those held to fulfill a regulation to those held because of a felt need; from those dominated by the administrator to those with wide teacher participation; from those seeking solution to administrative details to those seeking solution to basic issues and problems; from those characterized by personal opinion in solving detailed problems to those evidencing in securing understanding on basic issues; and from those proceeding by emotional expression of opinion to those proceeding with intelligent reference to a stated point of view.
2. The faculty gradually developed an improved technique of working together by committees, by departments, and by the total faculty.
3. The faculty became more skillful in discovering, defining, and solving problems.
4. The faculty became more conscious of the power, personal pleasure, and effectiveness of group participation in an on-going situation.

5. Faculty solidarity was developed which made for a feeling of security, of belongingness, and of usefulness.
6. Individuals and the group developed common understandings and beliefs sufficient to make group action possible.
7. Teachers become more aware of the function of purpose and goals in effective learning.
8. Teachers broadened their concept of instructional materials.
9. Teachers became aware of the need for a school philosophy. They developed a basic point of view concerning the nature of learning and the nature of society.
10. The total school program was expanded to include guidance, social living, health and recreation, and community relations. The library was expanded.
11. Greater attention was given to psychological principles of learning and to individual differences.

So far as the administration is concerned, progress was made in the following particulars:

1. Instruction was given a place of equal importance with administrative routine. Purposeless classroom observation gave way to cooperative group planning.
2. More emphasis was placed upon acquainting the public with the needs of the school.
3. A school philosophy affecting and including the administration as well as the entire school was developed.
4. The personal growth of the administrator as an educational leader was enhanced.

In the extensive study made by Mary A. O'Rourke[3] in 1954, the following results of the workshop are enumerated:

I. The Effect of Workshop Participation Upon Administrative Practices
   - A. The workshop is an effective vehicle for cooperative attack upon problems of school organization, methods, and policy.
   - B. The local school departmental workshop, particularly, is a means of effecting improvement in the curriculum.
   - C. The local school departmental workshop provides a center for the induction of new teaching personnel, for interchange of ideas, for deposit of the materials of instruction.
   - D. Teachers maintain security while making changes because consultants are present to work with the teachers.
   - E. The workshop gives training in group processes applicable in the classroom.
   - F. It improves teacher status in the community through fostering favorable interaction between school and community.

Kelley[4] has an excellent summary of expressions of opinion from participants over the period 1944-1947. The areas in which change was recognized as actually operating were: attitudes, teaching methods, personal growth, human relations, reduction of prejudice, nature of democracy, skill in using resources (staff and printed materials).

General Principles for Evaluating the Workshop

The following list of general principles to be observed in the evaluation of a workshop are those suggested by O'Rourke and Burton:[15]

1. The workshop staff should attempt continuous evaluation of individual students. Records of projects proposed, questions asked, processes worked out and used, results achieved are important. Anecdotal reports are of use. Records of conferences held with level of question, insight, and learning noted are very valuable.
2. Students should be given the opportunity to participate in continuous appraisal of themselves, their fellow workshoppers, the staff, and the workshop program generally.
3. Evaluations may be made on both individual progress and group projects and contributions thereto.
4. Students should be encouraged to keep their own folders of experiences similar to that kept by staff members.
5. Follow-up techniques which provide for observation in classrooms of participants during the year are the most logical procedure but this cannot always be followed because of time and personnel involved.
6. Recording the evaluations in individual and school records presents a few problems. Many workshops use the term "Credit" for satisfactory work. Others give everyone a "B" for satisfactory work, but this should be understood by all concerned. University and college requirements often complicate the recording of evaluations. Local adjustments need to be worked out.

What is to be Evaluated?

Practically every person, process, and resource may at one time or another be evaluated. The following list indicates most of these items:

I. During the Workshop
   - A. Mechanics and Organization
     1. Length of workshop
     2. Time of year
     3. Physical facilities
     4. Library facilities
     5. Resource materials
     6. Scheduling
     7. Allocation of time for various activities
     8. Committees
     9. General procedures of operation

B. Process and Staff
   1. Advance planning
   2. Method of determining objectives; defining problems; organizing interest groups
   3. Availability of qualified resource people
   4. Number and distribution of regular staff
   5. Degree to which individual needs are met
   6. Neglected areas
   7. Morale and cohesiveness
   8. Degree of democratic participation
   9. Effectiveness of problem-solving
   10. Opportunities for reporting (intragroup and intergroup)
   11. Activities of most value
   12. Activities of least value
   13. Ways of improving the workshop
   14. Ways the sponsoring institution could provide help at the time; through follow-ups

C. Individual Growth
   1. In ways of working together
   2. Increase in knowledge of resources and how to use them
   3. In development of usable plans for use in teaching; classroom, or supervision or administration, clinical work, etc.
   4. In changed attitudes and understandings
   5. In achievement of workshop objectives; individual objectives

II. After the Workshop

A. Evidence showing degree to which participants have
   1. Improved their own teaching as a result of the workshop.
   2. Improved and extended their understandings and attitudes toward education, pupils, patrons, co-workers, etc.
   3. Improved their ability to secure pupil interest, to stimulate learning, and many other aspects of learner's activity.
   4. Increased willingness and ability to assume responsibility, exercise initiative, and other personal-social-moral traits.
   5. Increased insight into basic problems of education, into criticisms of education and ways of answering critics, and others.
   6. (The acquisition of many other aspects could be listed.)[6]

General Summary

The workshop has now been clearly established as a valuable in-service procedure for stimulating growth and development of school personnel. Educators from the United States, many of them on Fulbright scholarships, have assisted

the educational systems of many foreign countries in the use of the workshop procedure.

The workshop, when properly operated, contributes basically to several important aspects of education:

1. Integration of theory and practice is encouraged through the presentation of real problems drawn from functional situations.
2. Growth and development of school personnel at all levels is greatly stimulated in both personal and professional areas. Greater insight and skill is developed concerning principles and practices of teaching-learning, cooperative group work, physical and mental health, community-school interrelationships.
3. Integration of approach is stimulated when all members of the school staff, community members and organizations work together on meeting the needs of the community, the schools, and the learners.
4. Community interest in, understanding of, and support for the schools is developed.
5. Training of educational leaders is improved as they participate in democratic group procedures while dealing with real problems.
6. New departures and innovations are introduced to school and community with security of personnel preserved.
7. Research on problems confronting school systems is encouraged and guided.
8. Systematic self-evaluation by the educational personnel on all levels is stimulated.
9. The participatory group process, vital to democratic life, is promoted in all areas of school and community work.
10. The orientation of persons wishing to return to teaching or other school-community work is speeded.[7]

The potential of the in-service workshop is great. Starting as a courageous innovation in education, the workshop has greatly revitalized the whole concept and practice of in-service education and contributed greatly to the improvement of instruction. Perhaps the decades ahead will bring some procedure which will make the workshop obsolete, but until that time, the workshop seems to be one of the more promising procedures for effecting worthwhile and lasting improvemnts in the teaching-learning process.

END NOTES

Chapter I

[1]Mode Lee Stone, "An Analysis of the Total Faculty Workshop Technique." Unpublished doctoral dissertation (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1941). p. 1.

[2]Mary O'Rourke and William Burton, Workshops for Teachers. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957). p. 1.

[3]Stone, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[4]Stone, op. cit., pp. 122-123.

Chapter II

[1]Paul Diederich and Van Til, The Workshop. (Danville: Interstate Printers, 1945). pp. 1-3.

[2]Mary O'Rourke and William Burton, Workshops for Teachers. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957). p. 1.

[3]Ralph W. Tyler, "Trends in the Preparation of Teachers," School Review, April, 1943, pp. 207-212.

[4]Leander L. Boykin, "What is a Workshop?," Progressive Education, January, 1955, pp. 5-7.

[5]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1945). p. 453.

[6]Mode Lee Stone, "An Analysis of the Total Workshop Technique," Unpublished doctoral dissertation (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1941). p. 166.

[7]James E. Downes, "An Evaluation of Workshops," Elementary School Journal, April, 1947, pp. 446-450.

[8]O'Rourke and Burton, op. cit., p. 3.

[9]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[10]W. Carson Ryan and Ralph W. Tyler, Summer Workshops in Secondary Education. (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1939). p. 40.

[11]Leander Boykin, "What is a Workshop?" Progressive Education, January, 1955, pp. 5-7.

[12]Harl R. Douglass, Rudyard K. Bent, and Charles W. Boardman, Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961). pp. 51-52.

[13]Kenneth L. Heaton, Professional Education for Experienced Teachers: The Program of the Summer Workshop. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940). pp. 21-41.

[14]O'Rourke and Burton, op. cit., pp. 5-8.

[15]Diedrich and Van Til, op. cit., pp. 4-13.

[16]Ibid., p. 5.

Chapter III

[1]Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools. (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955). p. 201.

[2]Ibid., pp. 201-202.

[3]Mary O'Rourke and William Burton, Workshops for Teachers. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957). p. 35.

[4]Ibid., p. 37.

[5]Ibid., p. 41.

[6]O'Rourke and Burton, op. cit., p. 2.

[7]Chester T. McNerney, Educational Supervision. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951). pp. 302-303.

Chapter IV

[1]Paul B. Diedrich and William Van Til, The Workshop. (Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1945). p. 12.

[2]Mode Lee Stone, "An Analysis of the Total Faculty Workshop Technique." Unpublished doctoral dissertation (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1941). pp. 97-99.

[3]Mary A. O'Rourke, "The In-Service Workshop in Elementary Education: Its Effect Upon Participants." Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1954). pp. 4-5.

[4]Earl C. Kelley, The Workshop Way of Learning. (New York: Harpers, 1951). pp. 105-125.

[5]O'Rourke and Burton, op. cit., pp. 68-69.

[6]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

[7]Ibid., pp. 97-98.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Adams, Harold P. and Frank G. Dickey. Basic Principles of Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1953.

Barr, A. S., William H. Burton, and Leo J. Brueckner. Supervision Principles and Practices in the Improvement of Instruction. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Boardman, Charles. Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.

Burton, William H. and Leo J. Brueckner. Supervision, A Social Process. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955.

Briggs, Thomas H. Improving Instruction. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

Diedrich, Paul B. and William Van Til. The Workshop. Danville: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1945.

Douglass, Harl R., Rudyard K. Bent, and Charles W. Boardman. Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1961.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1945.

Gwynn, J. M. Theory and Practice of Supervision. New York: Dodd, Mead Company, 1961.

Hammock, Robert C. and Ralph S. Owings. Supervising Instruction in Secondary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955.

Hicks, Hanne J. Educational Supervision in Principle and Practice. New York: The Ronald Press, 1960.

Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil. Supervision, A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

O'Rourke, Mary A. and William H. Burton. Workshops for Teachers. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Reeder, Edwin H. Supervision in the Elementary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953.

Spears, Harold. Improving the Supervision of Instruction. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953.

Swearingen, Mildred E. Supervision of Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.

Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

B. PERIODICALS

Boykin, Leander L. "What is a Workshop?" Progressive Education, January, 1955.

Downes, James E. "An Evaluation of Workshops." Elementary School Journal, April, 1947.

Edwards, Phyllis O. "A New Slant on an Old Question: In-Service Workshops." The Grade Teacher, September, 1962.

Hartung, Maurice L. "Trends in the Workshop Movement." School Review, December, 1946.

Herrick, V. E. "What Makes a Good Workshop." Childhood Education, May, 1946.

Hill, Wilhelmina. "Workshops: Their Value and Problems." School and Society, January, 1941.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Trends in the Preparation of Teaachers." School Review, April, 1943.

C. UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

Mitchell, James Russell. "The Workshop as an In-Service Education Procedure." Bloomington: Indiana University, 1954. (Typed)

O'Rourke, Mary A. "The In-Service Workshop in Elementary Education: Its Effect Upon Participants." Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1954. (Typed)

Stone, Mode Lee. "An Anlysis of the Total Faculty Workshop Technique." Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941. (Typed)